



H: ( ) needs a little more. Because you will always get into trouble when you assume that there are sub-centers. And many times the assumption is quite correct. It would mean, of course, that for a one-brained being, it might have three sub-centers and each of the sub-centers is a little bit ( ) in accordance with the other possibilities of centers. Now, one can say of course that the plant only has one center which is the physical one and that represents the totality of the plant, and that it will not have any sub-centers because there is no need for it. But that is a little bit strange if you then compare that to a man or even an animal who also has a physical center, a physical body, and we assume there that there are different parts which function either intellectually or emotionally. So why should it then be excluded from a plant? At the same time, if we suppose that there are sub-centers, they are called sub-centers, they are not full grown. So they do function regarding either the physical or emotional ( ) of an intellectual kind which belong to a very narrow limit ( ) of existence within themselves, and then, in man, when there are sub-centers of the physical, it would be called an imaginative function. So, to what extent now does an animal, if we take him as a two-centered being, does an animal have sub-centers and is there any intellectual activity? You see, again you run into this difficulty, because an animal also has some organs. There is it registered? An animal without any question smells; it also has eyes to see; it can hear. In man it is registered in the brain. And the brain we call a third center. So an animal must have some kind of a division somewhere, that we cannot say immediately that it is only physical and emotional. One can also say that, if there are two centers, it may be physical and intellectual. But then you get into trouble with this difficulty, which comes after which? And one assumes then that an animal has no feeling center. You see, there are difficulties involved, and it sounds very glad to say, ah, yes, that is



a sub-conscious being, that is a two-sided being, and a three-sided one. But, as far as awareness is concerned, it is of course an awareness principally in one's intellect. When there is no intellect, then of course there is no possibility for an awareness, and therefore usually except one, whatever awareness may mean as an anticipation of the future. I think it has to be explained a little differently, because the functions in an animal are actually not so well developed as in man if we suppose that the intellectual possibility for a man includes for him that he has memory, and that because of that he is able to continue his thinking process different from an animal. This is a fundamental difference between them even if you assume that an animal has some form of an intellectual hypothesis. It starts with him and it ends with him. When there is something in a memory, or something that can contribute to accomplishments of a past generation, which man can do. I've mentioned a few times, (

) because it's a time-binding element. It simply means that man is able to use all the different results obtained by anyone who has lived before him, and can continue building on top of that. And an animal has exactly that trouble, that whenever he stops, it is as if he goes to square one and starts it afterwards. Not so long ago I mentioned it, and then I didn't explain it well enough, but what it really means is, if you have a very clever animal, which is a very clever way of doing it, you certainly have to assume that there is an intellectual capacity in the animal to be able to do this kind of thing. The sons and daughters of the human race can continue what the fathers have started. They always have to start with a new start, and the old start is simply there for the life of that one human, and that's all there is to it. So, there is some difficulty. And as far as man is concerned, his ability to use whatever results have already been accomplished or received or made by the past generation enables man, now because of that, to build further on top of what already is there, and then has the possibility of projecting it in accordance with

that kind of development into the future. And this we call is man an anticipation possibility. That is, he has now because of being able to collect whatever has gone on before and putting himself on the standpoint of using what is really not his own but what he has acquired, with this now man achieves and reaches the possibility of looking into the future and to anticipate. Now awareness in the sense of Gurwitsch would mean that man is at certain times not only noticing, that is, becoming in the ordinary sense of the word aware of his existence, but that his awareness, according to Gurwitsch, includes that he has an attitude as if he is away from himself. I mean by that, that whenever man now starts to think and he notices different things about other people and about himself, that then he has the chance of becoming objective in regard to it. So it presupposes in an awareness that an intellectual capacity where an awareness of an existence would be registered, that that is free from any feeling influence. Now of course one can argue that man has that every once in while by accident, but as a usual pattern of nature it doesn't exist. And in that sense man is very much the same as an animal. And if one says, do animals have it, the question is, really? Why don't all kinds of things have it? And it is without any question that a living being hasn't got it as long as he lives on earth and his life runs kind of smooth. But now, the question is, why can man have an awareness? As a result of what? It presupposes that man, when he lives, is not satisfied with the way he is living. Suppose if he accepted his existence for whatever it was, he had no wish to change it, and only to live his life up to it calmly, and very little time about what the future might bring, and only a hope that whatever the future may have in store for him, that it will be of the same kind as what he had at the present time, if his life is pleasant. Now it is difficult to compare man as an animal, if an animal really suffers the way we do, because the suffering is not only that there may be certain dislocations, physical suffering—dislocations in



the structure, but it is also the thought about it that produces any time in us a pain. And this we call the suffering. Now if there is no intellect, and an animal which might hurt his particular paw or so, may even see blood and may discover that he cannot walk on it, but it is a question, will he have pain when he has no associations with the pain as we have in our minds. Now, there are many other questions connected with it, because I say if awareness is only an intellectual function, there is probably no possibility that any animal even thinks about that as a future possibility for him. But if awareness belongs also to a feeling, that is if there is an awareness that can come to man as a realization of what he is without his intellect taking any part, and nevertheless when it reaches him intuitively, as a quote through his feeling center, without any intellectual awareness, then he has as such through this feeling a knowledge which in his feeling center will produce a wish for a change. Now if it is put on that basis, I am afraid that an animal might have an awareness. But you see the awareness now is linked up with immediate surroundings and I don't think it is linked up with the possibility of growth, but as far as the awareness of surroundings and awareness, I think that animals are extremely clever, clever in the real sense of the word and, I believe, are far cleverer of us as human beings, because they are not numbered. But if you take an animal that has been brought up in nature, a wild animal always having to take care of himself, his particular perceptions, that is whatever he considers his own sense organs, and that is in the case of many animals better developed than ours and also that there is a certain sense what we from our standpoint call sense, sensory perception, which an animal has as far as smell, or a much wider range in hearing than what we have, then it is difficult to compare an animal on that basis with whatever human beings are. But there is no doubt that an animal has a sense of existence and a sense of being able to find his way back home, whatever it may mean, and also that he has a sense of approaching danger, which we don't have. Also, their living

as close to nature, and having to defend ( ) its physical existence, that because of that he understands nature much better than we do. And that any animal for instance gathering food for the coming winter is in a situation where we have because of our wonderful intellect always hoped that it won't be so bad. An animal knows, and gathers food and then retires or stays in his little hole or whatever it is and only comes out on a good day to make sure that the winter is over ( ). I think in this way you might also call it an intellect. And it is quite definitely an awareness because it has to do with a more and more objective viewpoint of the totality of everything that surrounds him including himself. And that there is very little room in an animal to feel sorry for himself. And most of the time our difficulty is remaining aware in a way that is not a mixture of either fear or the wish to feel sorry interferes with our wish also to become aware. You see, it can remain quite complicated. If you let us talk a little longer it will be more complicated, so better stop.

Q: You mentioned sub-centers. I haven't heard that term before.

N: Oh! There's something for you to find then. ( ) are three sub-centers. You know, you and I are still on the basis of three words. So the three sub-centers, would you like to have words for them? (Reply: yes) Physical center we understand? (Reply: yes) The sub-center could be a division of three in the physical center. The names would be physical-physical, emotional-physical, intellectual-physical. All right. (Reply: All right) The emotional center also has three sub-centers: physical-emotional, emotional-emotional, intellectual-emotional. Intellectual center also has three: physical-intellectual, emotional-intellectual, intellectual-intellectual. Now we have nine. Now if we make three again of each we have twenty-seven. That's quite possible. These are usually represented by octaves within octaves. And one can actually, if you wish and want to take the time, try to divide the different functions of each center into three primary sub-centers and each of these again into



sub-center-sub-center, and so fourth. It's a very interesting pastime, if you want to study either physical physiology or psychology. Well, let's leave it at that, shall we? I'll tell you just another three words. All right? But read some ( ) Dostoevsky ( ) write something about it.

Q: He uses different terminology.

H: Sub-center? What does he say?

Q: He uses the intellectual part of the intellectual center, the emotional part, etc.

H: Doesn't he use sub-center? (Reply: no) Right? Does that matter whether it's a sub-center or a part? What's the point? Now, come, if you're not now, then you were here last week and you know that we talked about and you know approximately the kind of character of the parts of what we ( ) Yes.

Q: Well, I've been here, three weeks ago and I'm not familiar with anything ( ) an idea of what's going on. You'll forgive my questions yet.

H: Now who has an answer to that, one of those other, old-school. Now would you answer a question like that. Here an individual comes for three weeks, we sit and talk, talk, talk, and now he still doesn't know exactly what we are after. (Reply: in L...) Yes, do know that.

Q: I have mentioned . . . that's being abstract, but I'm not quite sure of the method, the procedure by which ( ) the method.

H: Good. Now I'll ask you a question. What is the goal?

Q: I think it's self-mastery, and self-mastery for the sake of happiness.

H: Hmmmm. Sounds interesting, but I don't think it's right. Self-mastery I could go along with, but not for happiness. Do you think that a happy state is a desirable aim? (Reply: yes) Really? You would you know happiness if you didn't know unhappiness.

Q: Well, I can see that I cannot do things that I really want to do, that there are voices inside me saying that I'm not doing the right thing. I really would

like to do those things, and I see myself not doing what I really want to do.

H: Does it make you unhappy? (Reply: yes) So you're not entirely happy?

(Reply: no, because I...) And for that reason you would like to become happier?

Q: Yes, to be happier.

H: How do you know that what you now at the present time dislike or think you should do and that you feel you ought to do, that ( ) that, if you were able to, that would be the right thing? What measure do you apply?

Q: I would have no regrets and I also would anticipate the future, instead of dread the future.

H: Are you dreading it now?

Q: Well, the way I am, judging from my past experience, that I have not been able to control myself, and anticipating that this might continue.

H: Why do you dislike lack of control? Why would you like to change it?

Q: Well, I don't see what other answer I can give you except that I would be happy.

H: Yes, but again I come back to that state of happiness--what is it based? You know, because one can be quite happy with the little voice if you don't heed it.

Q: Well, self-contentment.

H: Contentment perhaps/better is a balance within myself in that, you know, content, to be content means to be at peace. In that sense it is right. But it has to be in the sense that ( ) also means active. Because there are two ways of also having contentment or being happy. One is a low state in which very little goes on, and because of the low activity there is very little disturbance. The other is a high state of activity in which the different forces match each other and one can remain in balance. That happiness is such, a real joy can be produced by the knowledge that one is in equilibrium. In equilibrium would mean that I always will remain for myself whatever I wish



to be, regardless of the circumstances around me which will affect me. So if I have within myself that kind of stability, then it doesn't matter what kind of activity goes on around me or even to what kind of active state I am. And as such the level of my activity or my life is on a higher plane, and as such, being more alive, would become much more desirable. In between that particular state and the state of practical behavior in which very little happens and also the perception of happiness is rather dull there is, of course, a tremendous range of different states in which there can be happiness but also limited by a certain amount of, you would call it, controllability. And you have to decide now for yourself at what particular level you would be satisfied, the assumption being of course that I may have to go through a development of changing a happiness into a higher form of happiness. But also with that I must know that that kind of happiness has to be balanced by something that is unhappy, and that I whatever the law will not be affected by either one. This is the true meaning of a balance. It might shift from one place to another, but at any one point the balance means that there is an equality between that affects me one way or that affects me in another. Now when I start to define that as a difference between two different points, one, as I say, a rather low state, and the other a quite heightened state of activity, the measurement for my happiness will be based on my own state of perception. Now I digest whatever comes in on me in the form of impressions or of other people with whom I am dealing and also my ability to deal with them that I call digesting. So that I in this form of happiness know of nothing beyond my own education, what I've learned, and I also become dependent on what other people have told me which I accept because I have no direct experience. And in general that what I consider for myself a happy state has to have been an experience of actually being that happy, and not theoretical but practical. Now if I define happiness in that sense, then I naturally in the way I live, I become limited

TO

because I do not have all the possibilities of being affected by everything that might come in my life. And if, even at the present time, I am happy—that is, assuming even for a moment I am balanced—it may be because my experiences have been limited. And that together with a different kind of experience, I would become unhappy. If the road of trying to become happy, in the same way that you mean it, and in the sense that I mean it as becoming more balanced and really giving one joy, there has to be something which is generally within one, which constantly can close to the influence whatever anything from the outside world might affect it. You see, it's an entirely different kind of definition. And it's quite necessary to keep on thinking about it, because whatever you now consider a happy state, is what others in it your own? What is considered happiness in general, and that you also have taken on from the outside world for yourself and with which you are satisfied without ever having tested it. I think you have to try to consider it a little bit more from the standpoint of your own knowledge, your own experience, and what you realize you are at the present time, and put it together with what you expect your life might become. And with that of course you have something much further to depend on, because if it is something that becomes more dependent on your efforts, then all you're required is a certain amount for the amount of effort or enthusiasm or willingness to work for a certain aim that is available to you. And ( ) that six business linked up with what you consider yourself to be now and what you consider yourself to be potentially, if that only could be actualized in the future in the way you wish. But now, if that is a definition which is quite tentative for a little while, then the question comes up, how do I know that contingents, which I do not at the present time experience and which may be in the future, are going to disturb me? So far the experience is based only on that what I have met so far in my life. And ten years from now I may be living in an entirely conditions of life, I may have different kind of friends, I may have different responsibilities,



I may also have a different way of living economically speaking, professionally, whatever it may be, and I may have added in the meantime an enormous amount of responsibilities which at the present time I don't have. And then if I take on which are quite logical possible developments in my life, if I take that now and compare it with what I have at the present time, then even if at the present time I am a little unhappy or a little bored, that really has very little meaning as compared to the totality of the possibilities of myself ten years from now. So again if I look at it that way, then I have to consider what is my life as a possibility of becoming what, and in that that kind of a condition will I be with what that I then bring to it, and to what extent can I then surmount whatever conditions are thrown upon me over which I have absolutely no control. If the world were of my own making, it might be different. If I lived on an uninhabited island and built up my own house and had no dealings with other people and if I could live on a mountain and depend on and sit under the palm trees, life would be very different. But with the complexity of life as it is now, this whole idea of being happy is kind of pushed out of the window. You understand what I mean? It is much more serious than you think. It is not a question of mastery. At first you might say it is a question of adaptation. I'm not going to quibble about it, that in order to be able to adapt, one has to be master. But the adaptation includes anything that happens on the other side affecting me. Mastery would mean that I've got something that I become master of the outside world, and that I never will. But I may be able to adapt myself.

Q: Isn't this self-mastery, if I may . . .

H: It's not self-mastery. It is that you only see yourself, that you are limited in the experiences which at the present time you have about, and which for the future you cannot define. And self-mastery being based now on what I have, has to be a very special kind that I will be able to experience influences which I do not know as yet, to the extent that I know what effect they will have on me. When I say to adapt oneself, of course ( ) is the form of being able

to live under certain conditions without being disturbed, and to keep the balance that I might have at the present time. And so if I want to go in that direction, it will mean that I have to develop something in me that can remain stable regardless of how much more, spontaneous gain. Now on that basis, that what man's life could become is a development of himself in a very definite spiritual sense more and more independent of that what is the physical world. And although there need not be any particular conflict, it certainly is necessary that the emphasis of that kind of development is in a different direction than the way we at the present time measure it, our so-called success in life.

What have you read? In general, what are you interested in, in the reading?

Q: Well, I'm a philosophy major. I'm doing my Master's.

H: Good. Well, you have to learn to think.

Q: ( )

H: Yes, that's good. Very good. Have you read any of Nordhoff's?

Q: I've read Ouspensky's In Search of the Miraculous.

H: What appealed to you in that?

Q: Well, first, the notion that there are many selves. For instance, at night one of my selves tells me to get up in the morning, and in the morning another self takes over and ignores the previous self.

H: Does it? I mean, I know Ouspensky says that, but don't think it's true?

Q: From personal experience.

H: Is it? When you get up in the morning, don't you remember you made a promise to yourself?

Q: I do, but. . .

H: It's not a question that of ignoring. It's simply that one's a little more than the other. Ouspensky makes it so as if we don't remember anymore.

Q: You remember, but the desire changes.



N: But why wouldn't it? Because there are always different facets of a man, that is, his mode of expression. Why should it be called even another self or a little I or something. I don't think it's a very helpful concept. Regarding people when I talk to them, I'm always putting on different kinds of faces. I'm different with different people.

Q: It seems there is a desire and then there is also a reflection upon the desire. The reflection is stable but the desire changes constantly. And if one is...

N: Wait a minute now. If there is a desire and it has a reflex--on what? It is reflective on what?

Q: The desire doesn't seem to reflect. There is something else which seems to reflect on the desire.

N: I don't understand that. What is this something else that reflects on the desire?

Q: I don't know, but I can see my desire, I can objectify my desire, I can look at my desire.

N: Can you? With what?

Q: I'm aware of my desire.

N: Are you? Aware in the real sense, that is, impartial? Try to be exact about this kind of language, you know.

Q: It seems that in one sense I actually am impartial, I look at it objectively. I see how this desire is linked to the future. Perhaps I see that following this desire will lead to bad consequences.

N: You are engaged in that state in a thought process considering a desire and remembering where the desire might lead to. That is not objectivity.

Q: I mean this desire is objectified, it is looked upon as an object.

N: It is nice to say it, but at the same time I'm still mixed up with it. You see, objectivity means I'm free. Objectivity in the sense of the word simply means there is an object and there is a subject in this case which, if you

wish to look at it, observes, and then the better turn is observed and observed. And that the recording of that whatever the object is has to be free entirely from any form of prejudice, the wish or desire to change it. Now if I start to apply that to any particular kind of state in which I am, in which my personality has a desire, I'm very far from the freedom, because I consider even where it will lead to, and I become completely identified with my desire. There's no reflex whatsoever. I only happen to think about what will come of my desire, and where it will lead to. And then I will say, I don't want that desire, so because the results are not very lovely and for that reason I shouldn't have it. And then, what happens? You think you don't have the desire?

Q: Well, the desire still exists.

R: I'm afraid so. And no amount of thought about it will ever change it. (Reply in agreement; no) You see, you're still engaged in ordinary subjective matters, of course. It is nice to say, I objectify, and it sounds good, but it is not the truth, that's all. You remain completely subjective, because you remain completely attached. There are extremely few things even in the outside world we look at and we say, it leaves no void, which would be the real meaning of becoming objective in the sense of this impartiality. Even when I look at a chair, I can't take it away from the idea, will it sit all right? or I don't like the color, or the design is kind of horrible, or perhaps it doesn't even fold up. I can't help it. These thoughts will all the time take place, and there is no question even of thinking that I can be objective to them. If a judge is to pronounce a judgment on two criminals, or that, and measure out a certain punishment, of course he has to be objective because of the scales of justice. But is he, and can he be? And sometimes it is utterly impossible for him because he happens to sympathize with whatever the person has done and understands it, and has to weigh one thing and another and another and finally come to a certain judgment in accordance with his conscience, and so. He has



to go through all that rigmarole of subjectivity finally to reach a certain final result the right way which is as close to objectivity as possible. But it is not objective. It has gone through his mind, he has weighed it as well as he possibly can and given it all the advantages of considering it in the proper way with all the consequences that belong to it, but still he made a subjective judgment.

Q: Are there objective...?

H: Yes there are. That is right. There are two possibilities. One is that everything is considered exactly the same by everybody, and the other is that the scientists can see something--I talked about that the other, what was it, on Wednesday? When did I talk about it? Was it on Wednesday or Sunday? Last week then. Were you here last night? Talked about the universe and boiling points or melting points. There are objective facts in nature, and particularly when a person considers them and then sees certain qualifications or certain properties of that what is being seen and which is available by everybody else, and that all of this come to the same conclusion--then it approaches the question of an objective fact. That is potentially the only kind. Because if there is one person who differs, it still remains subjective. But if it is, in the proper sense of the word, absolute and from a scientific standpoint changes over from a hypothesis into an axiom, then we reach objectivity. But, you see, these things are regarding ( ) facts. And what Goudjard is talking about and what someone else in a while talks about, is objectivity about oneself. And it is exactly there where the difficulty is, because I am constantly affected and identified with myself and I cannot be objective about myself, unless something there exists in my brain which is functioning differently from the way it is functioning now. If objectivity really means what it says, that there is an object to be seen, which object is not the subject, and is completely divorced from the subject--the subject may be observer--then objectivity is something that is unobtainable. It is

the only definition that would last forever. Now, when I look for something that is non-subjective in my totality of making me a personality, the way I behave as a human being, it is a priori already admitted that everything I do, everything I think, and everything I feel is subjective. And it includes my brains. And never mind how I try to become objective, as long as I use my brains which are subjective, I have to come to a subjective result. And only if I say, I take in the help of a variety of different humans, and then reach with the totality of all such experiments made by such brains, and divide it by the number of such brains, I then come to a fact which might be considered an average, and that I may approximate the possibility of an objective fact. There is no other way. Whenever I keep on thinking in the way I do, I never will be objective. It would be an interesting thing to write a thesis about objectivity, wouldn't it? Where do you study?

Q: C.C.N.Y.

N: Do you have good professors?

Q: I don't think so.

N: That's too bad. If you could have some kind of someone, you know, who would really understand, with whom you could argue, you could sharpen your own intellect.

Q: I don't want to argue this or that ...

N: To argue will help you. Arguing will be a means for you to place the different viewpoints together, to see what is most acceptable to yourself. You cannot get it only out of books. And if there is no one around, I'm afraid you have to talk with yourself. It is a different kind of function in your brain. And your brain will help you if it has many more different kind of functions than what at the present they could be allowed by just reading. And this is of course based on the fact which is quite well known that whenever a mind is receiving the impression by means of the eyes, the kind of knowledge is different than when the mind receives a different kind of knowledge by means of hearing. And exactly in that kind of difference,



a difference of functions of the mental function. Then there is a possibility of one being retained. That is, actually going into memory without forgetting it, and the other being simply received and temporarily being given a little bit of room, and after some time will disappear, even out of memory. The one, that is, that which reaches one through hearing, or through a sound, or through an association of sound with that what is knowledge, can produce a certain impact, which impact will be stored in the memory and to some extent will be unforgettable. As far as the visual possibility is concerned as reading in a book, it is stored and retained for a little while, a particular place that can be recalled, but very often it is not deep enough to have been given any permanent place, and after some time little facts go on top of it, and some others go on top of it, and that what I have read at least two years ago I have forgotten completely. One can verify this quite easily. So far that reason I say if you can have a chance of talking and hearing someone else talk or hear yourself talk there is a possibility of that kind of an argument, which then might, when it comes to a good conclusion, stick. And then it becomes permanent for you. And it is exactly the permanency that we talked about, because from the standpoint of permanency the different selves or the different I's, or the different little I's, can be seen. And if I could live pure in that permanency I wouldn't make a mistake about having in mind that I have to get up tomorrow morning at 5 o'clock, that I now make a recalled promise to that little self. But if I do make a promise to that what is permanent, I actually will remember the next morning and I will get up. I eliminate all the little I's, you see, and put in its place something that is, I would almost say now, scientifically speaking, more scientific. If you can have that I mean. Don't dwell too much on that particular little phase of permanency. We are all kinds of colors of the rainbow. It depends entirely on our education and the way we

live each day, and even if each man has different kinds of facets or parts of himself, or little windows through which he looks at the outside world, the totality of any one man in having a different way of looking at different things at different times is already tremendous. I change during the day so many times I don't know it. But if I start to study it, I know well enough that almost every five minutes I have a different kind of thought, though all associative, and that's what fools me, but nevertheless <sup>they are</sup> quite different. If I supervise something, and I go and out, I have an entirely different viewpoint of the world after I've satisfied myself, my stomach. When I'm hungry at eleven-thirty I can get cranky, and I will not even love my mother-in-law, but after lunch, I could even bring her flowers. You see, it happens like that in the life of man as he is. Already he ( ). What happens when he lives through different seasons, or a year, or ten years? What happens to him when he's exposed to different people with whom he has dealings, and which produce in him different reactions? You know the conditions in which we are physically, and a little bit emotionally, and perhaps intellectually, if your associations will allow me, will allow you to have a little bit, a very small little bit, of so-called traditional thought. But <sup>all</sup> of that contributes to the different colors of the valuing of my personality, and depending entirely on what is affecting me or what I am expected to do, I will behave in accordance with it. And for that reason, I said before, this whole question of happiness is so completely dependent on the way I was brought up. I don't even know what it means, and only a certain technology which is more or less pleasing to me. I am happy, I say, when I take a shower, and it is the right kind of temperature, not too cold and not too hot, and I feel well, and my physical well-being, my physical state, will make me happy. And then I get a letter, and someone writes to me in the letter, and then I'm not happy. Read the last chapter of Gurdjieff's book. The man, great man, executive, with a chauffeur and a car, walking on the street--first he had trouble with his brush and had broken the mirror ( ), and he loses his



composure completely. But then he gets a nice little telephone call and he is very happy. Then he goes out, and he has everything. When he walks, he ( ) first of all the chauffeur in the car follows him at a little distance. And so he has an idea, it is still a little early, I don't have to go to the office as yet, there is probably an assistant who will take care of it, so why doesn't he go in a little restaurant and some coffee and sit, and you know, maybe get the morning newspaper. So he sits at the table, and there he is, and opposite him is a nice young lady who looks at him with very interesting eyes, and he is happy all over. This is the sixth. And whenever a person says, "I want to be happy," I am reminded very often of that; that is it that makes one happy, and what little thing can make you unhappy?—but for no reason or reason. Someone talks to me over the phone, and I find in that a little indication of something that reminds me of something else, and it brings back a whole lot of memories which at that time I thought I was through with. I'm not. And I'm disturbed for one hour. And I walk up and down, why should we use that kind of a word for me, I ask, who am I, what? They dare do that to me. What I'm not...and I sit down and there I am. Happy? No. Unhappy? yeh... This is not unconsciousness. And a happy state belongs still to a certain preferable state of unconsciousness. And you can change what you like and tomorrow it will be gone. And there's no guarantee of any form of happiness, even if you have \$10,000 in the bank, that that will make you happy the day after tomorrow. Put your thinking cap on. Try to think what is meant by these things and see what implication it is in your mind. What do you wish. And then what do you have, or what do you have this desire to be happy? Why happy? To be a man, yes. It is far happier that one is a man, that one can cope with conditions the way they are, and that they are not going to sway one, and that I keep on having conditions regardless. Here is a man who remains a man when everything goes wrong. Surely it would be unhappy (unclear )).

Life is important, and the acceptance of life, to saving you to life, regardless of whatever conditions may be, that I remain man, I wish a man to be under any conditions, in any kind of a circumstance. When you study philosophy, put it on that basis, and find out what the different philosophers were after. They were not after ideas. They were after something, some truth, which would tell them what is the reason for the existence of themselves, and the place where they belong, and where other people belong, and whatever it was that they wanted to argue about. Many times, and it need not go into any religious sense, of giving a certain ( ) to one's life, philosophy can for many reasons still be contained in one's intellect and can produce many good states and many enjoyable conditions of wanting to think about how this and how that, and sometimes a good philosopher doesn't meet much of life. Our dear friend, Edmund Husserl, never went out of Hagenberg, you know, and still he wrote *Erkenntnis der reinen Vernunft*. That is a quite marvelous kind of a book. So, one can limit oneself in life, if you wish, and one can be to some extent (nuclear-wise ( ) ), who's leaving? (None). What for? Now, we've said enough, haven't we? Time has been time. I'm not arguing with you, you know that. I'm not trying to take away from you what you have. Keep having it, but experience it, make it part of you. Now what other kind of ( ), arguments, can we talk about? Oh, you can bring up more things to this. It's like a market place, you know. Putting something on the table. What is the difference? You can always find something to talk about, if you want to bring it up. What?

Q: What is the meaning of that part in the passage which says, "If thine eye be single, ..." Does that have anything to do with following a certain path or philosophy and looking at life through that channel?

N: Well, you know what it means to get in that way. Do you know the translation? You think the translation is correct?

Q: I don't know, (whether ( ) ) lot of reading.

N: Yes? We could philosophize about that. I can tell you what I think it means.



If one wishes to live in life, one has to be able to concentrate on that what one wishes with all oneself, and in that sense be able to concentrate on that and focus with all one's heart, with all of one's mind, and with all of one's physical body. It is that kind of unity, that one-unity if you like, which could become an eye, guiding and focusing in that direction in which my wish dictates to me where I have to go. This dictates to me where I have to go is based on the state of myself in accordance with the level of my consciousness. If you have an idea that you are really interested in pursuing it, make that idea your god. It simply means that there is nothing else because I live for that. When I now concentrate myself, that is, to focus myself, to that idea as god, everything else in ordinary life will drop away. I have no sin. That for me is that kind of course. Yes.

Q: I have a task to report on. I was told to read 25 pages of Gurdjieff.

N: How many?

Q: 25 pages. And to come to myself before I did the reading, and to write down what I understood, if anything. If I didn't understand anything it, not to write it down.

N: How did it work out?

Q: I think the benefit I derived from it came more after, much after the reading, and also before coming to myself. During the reading itself, I became aware of my voice and in fact I lost the thread of understanding . . .

N: What did you read, what part?

Q: From the beginning.

N: ( ) the beginning. How far did you get? Was it one week or two weeks?

Q: Two weeks. I was supposed to report earlier, but I (unlucky ) .

N: That's all right. It's good enough for two weeks.

Q: And I ended at Ashiata Shiamash.

N: You got that far?

Q: To Ashiata Shiamash.

N: Yes, you didn't read that yet.

Q: No, not yet.

H: Well, what do you think now of what you have read so far? If now you <sup>look and</sup> take a bird's eye view of everything that you have read up to this point--is this your first time to read it?

Q: No, (unclear).

H: All right, what do you think now? What is it? Is that beginning up to Ashita Shimon, religion and so forth starts, really the first part of the first volume. What is the idea that is behind it? The idea, there are Arousing of Thought, Ashi-<sup>Shimon</sup>, Ashi-<sup>Shimon</sup>, ideas of time, a little indication of descent, Ashi-<sup>Shimon</sup>, you know, so forth. What kind of <sup>idea</sup> do you now have. When you are this far, can you define what is the aim of Garguff? Why did he write it, and why did he start like that? And is already in the beginning everything that he writes about later in a nutshell?

Q: Excuse me?

H: In a nutshell. Is it already in a <sup>certain</sup> condensed form, that one could get out of the first hundred pages.

Q: In the Arousing of Thought, (unclear)...that's what...

H: Yes...yes...and becoming aware of gaining that.

Q: Yes, and putting all the passages on. That .... (unclear).

H: Yes. What is Hasegawa? Who is he?

Q: I think he's our essence.

H: He's what?

Q: He is...well, he's a stage which I feel myself to be at a certain age, maybe eleven or twelve.

H: No, age doesn't matter very much, because that's only in relation to the man that talks, which is Hasegawa, and he is <sup>young</sup>. So, Hasegawa of course is the development of something, very simple, very young, open for possibility of development and ( ), and listening now to his grandfather. Who is the grandfather? What is this Hasegawa, when he talks? To what extent or



whether or could you compare in yourself with Beelzebub?

Q: Something that... someone... something that's seen through me. /Something like remorse, the feeling I have at the time of remorse, it reminds me that I saw something at the beginning ...

H: You think Beelzebub represents in any way remorse?

Q: I think he... well, I cannot remorse with conscience.

H: Yes. And in you...

Q: ...and being able to... Well, remorse is the effect of conscience.

H: But Beelzebub is not conscience. When they sit and talk, where do they talk.

Q: In the space ship Karnak.

H: Yah, where?

Q: Under the glass ball ( without noise ) ...

H: Deme. What is the deme?

Q: What?

H: What is the deme?

Q: What is the deme?

H: Yah. It's the skull of your head. That's where you talk. Your mind is talking. And there is a real mind giving advice - that's Beelzebub. Who's Ahoon?

Q: Captain Ahoon?

H: No. Ahoon. Ahoon, the captain. He's not physical body. Essence: Essence of essence, willing to grow and develop, understanding of the present time. Wish to live, wish to communicate if possible, wish to communicate, to alleviate suffering, but not as yet capable because it's not full grown, and has to wait until he has more chance to have that in him. The captain: common sense. The ship Karnak: a dead body. Space ship: methods of life and development. Descent. Atlantic: essence within yourself which has sunk because of certain perturbations in one's life. Try to think a little more about it and see how you can place it. Where does this belong, where does that sit? And now, if you wish, for one week try to consider what you have read so far in this light.

and what kind of a meaning it might have. You won't get very far, but it will be very useful to try to think about. All right? So, will we stop then? No questions? Yeah?

Q: I'd just like to make a comment that I'm one of those here who would have liked to answer some of the questions which were asked, and hearing some of the answers that were given and then hearing some of the questions asked and the way you answered the questions later, I can't for the life of me think how the devil I could ever answer a question like you do.

N: Well, you have a what you call *feu de paille*.

Q: What's that?

N: Sometimes we call it *feu de bûche*. (unclear noise). It simply means a certain kind of words. The other day I said, "Isn't it a good thing I'm not Baba."

Q: That you're not what?

N: Baba., Myar Baba. (unclear) would not to speak. Yes, Mark.

It is of course logical that there is a certain difference between the way I would answer <sup>and</sup> someone else would answer, and sometimes I want to let it go, and listen to what someone else will want to say. At the same time, the question has to be satisfied sufficiently, and usually whatever the answer represents, it is not only an answer to a question, but it is placing the question and that what has been brought up as a subject in a proper light and in its proper perspective, so that afterwards, that whenever one comes to the same question from a different side, then it then still has a validity as an answer. You might say it is a certain way of answering and many times I want to continue until it has reached that particular point of clarity. It is a different way, and it is certainly not necessary to answer it the way I answer it. Also in that respect I think there are many roads that lead to Rome. But logically whenever any one person answers, he answers in accordance



with whatever is for his possible and whatever for him needs to be the answer to that kind of a question. But, thank God, there is no particular rule in the Bible to say that you have to use five minutes for an answer. That's all.

Q: Mr. Nyland, in school work and in my thinking is hard to apply my thinking in the proper direction, to have my thoughts to go in the right direction for the question I'm going to ask, I think it will be useful to me to know why when I stand in front of the hyacinth and the lilies of the valley that they emit an essence which is for me hard to explain the components of aliveness, awareness, and awareness, if I may use the word awareness. Therefore, if I am a three-brained individual and the hyacinth and the lily of the valley is a so-called one-brained individual, why in my mind of thinking to ... I am separate to the flower, I have no illusions... but how can I think of the flower which is designated a one-brained individual, and I am supposedly, because my brain here is not developed and the brain is ( ) here, isn't it possible... I'm asking the question: I have no essence to emit, to compare to the lily of the valley and to the hyacinth. Therefore I am sub-normal to the lily of the valley and I am sub-normal to the hyacinth. Therefore, I would like to approach, in the essence that is emitted, which I do not have, I would like to partake of the essence of the lily of the valley and of the hyacinth to have a comprehension and create the essence from another concept which is school work. I would like to learn from the lily of the valley and the hyacinth why it is they have a much greater essence than I have. Is this my question? Why is it they have the essence and I do not. I have to develop the essence and I have to develop the power and I want to use the brain which I have not. If I have a brain which I have not developed, but I feel that the lily of the valley and the hyacinth have all the things because they tell me they have the essence and I do not. If I knew how they had the essence, then I would have the essence.

N: Let's stop there. And (addressing another), will you answer?

Q: Well, as best I can at this point, I can say that I don't really understand what question you're asking.

N: Well, this is quite a difficult one. That is also the requirement. Sometimes a question is not entirely formulated, and then whoever has to answer has to reformulate it so that it becomes a real question.

Q: Well, isn't it ( ) to say, couldn't you reformulate your statement. If I can't understand the question.

N: It's quite right. You keep on asking the questioner what he really means.

Q: I can reformulate the question in much more simple language.

N: Make it now so that it is simple, and then (one of person trying to answer) can...

Q: Yes sir. I was trying to explain myself...

N: ...That's all right...

Q: ...Therefore, I shouldn't have used so many words. My question is, if a hyacinth and a lily of the valley, which is designated as a one-brained being, and I am in comparison a three-brained individual, why is it that the one-brained individual which is shown to me as a hyacinth and a lily of the valley, why does it have an essence which... come to me, and I haven't got the essence to give to it? It has the essence I do not, because I smell the essence.

Q: (Person trying to answer) Is essence you mean the essence?

Q: (questioner) The center. The center. The center. The magnetic center.

N: I think he means ... (unless someone I and I trying to answer ).

No, it's all right. But don't let's use words where they don't belong.

Q: I don't wish to use it... I didn't mean... I mean center, the center of the being of the flower.

N: Yeah, but we're talking now...

Q: This is a center...



N: Mark's (Q trying to answer) question is really quite right. Do you mean by essence what you smell, the essence...

Q: No, I mean the being of the one-brained...

N: But you don't smell that (unclear)

Q: (unclear-talking and noise) The essence is the doorway you knock on to get to the center of the being of the flower, because...

N: No, No.

Q: ...it tells you it has a being.

N: That is true. And you know that it has a being when a certain odor or fragrance (unclear)...

Q: But I think it's superior to me.

N: It is what?

Q: It is superior to me. I'm a three-brained being.

N: Why is it so?

Q: I believe that the lily of the valley is superior to me because it knows something that I do not know.

N: Good. Now it may be quite true that a lily of the valley, according to your viewpoint, is superior to you.

Q: (unclear) It's not philosophy.

N: It's clear now, Mark, what he wished to know?

Q: (Mark) Vaguely (unclear).

N: Will we continue a little bit more?

Q: (Mark) ... (unclear) as magnetic center of the flower ...

N: I know. He meant (unclear).

Q: I didn't mean that. Because me, I did not mean magnetic center. It slipped out.

N: Let's say you withdrew it.

Q: Yes sir. It slipped out.

H: Consider it not said, Mark.

Q: I didn't wish to say that. I didn't wish to say that. That's true, I didn't wish to say that. It was a mistake.

Q: (Mark) Now isn't it astounding that the night before last when he was rephrasing the question and when I said, well, by essence you mean aroma; then there was a certain conversation which took place which you interjected into the situation. I have subsequently forgotten what he asked.

H: (unclear--laughing). Consider what I said unaided.

Q: Could I rephrase the question?

H: (unclear-laughing). I will shut up. Go ahead.

Q: Shall I rephrase it?

H: Ask Mark.

Q: Shall I rephrase it?

Q: (Mark) All right. Here we go.

Q: Why does the lily of the valley and the hyacinth have a fragrance which is its essence and I do not have a like fragrance which could be interpreted as my essence.

Q: (Mark) Well, I'd say that the essence of each particular flower ( ) aroma, and you might say the nature of this particular thing is to give an aroma under certain conditions, and (unclear) this is the way the sun hits it and conditions with its growth, and various other factors which I don't know too much about. As far as my radiations from yourself in relation to an essence which is equivalent to an aroma coming out of a flower, ( ) just what you're speaking about.

Q: (questioner) Well, you'll excuse me (unclear). I do not mean an aroma being a static, outward, external happening or a radiation. I think that the essence that the flower has, which is its smell, is an internal situation.

Q: (Mark) You mean coming from the very inner structure of the flower, that (unclear on the outside continued on the inside.)



Q: Yea. It's a way that there is more to the flower than the external consideration of its fragrance.

Q: (Mark) And you feel that ( ) superior to something that is ( ) corresponding to you?

Q: I think it has something which I cannot have as a signal, a smell...in lightness...lightness of the flower. I am more dense in my smell. Is that correct?

M: I'm out of it.

Q: (unclear-noise ) if you were ( ) the essence that the flower is giving at the moment (unclear ) a corresponding something within yourself, either--let's not say aroma, let's say an intimation or radiation or something that also comes from your inner core, so to speak, though you be, say, a three-brained being compared to a one-brained being, and are you talking about certain essence which is coming out of you, and some relationship as to essence coming out of a one-brained being?

Q: I want to know why that essence comes out of the flower and it does not come out of me in the same way, and that I'm a stranger to the essence of the flower and the flower's essence is a stranger to me.

Q: (Mark) Well, now it sounds ...

Q: Why isn't there a level of understanding between me, being a superior three-brained individual and the flower, being the one-brained individual? Why can't there be a level of comprehension and understanding?

Q: (Mark) Well, first of all, in the makeup of this supposed one-brained being that doesn't have these other two brains developed as you have and therefore will not be able to rationalize, intellectualize, figure it out, think it out, whatever you want, or even come up to a degree of consciousness about a level, a situation which you could obtain because it's not inherent in the nature of the object.

Q: I should ~~then~~ then leave the flower alone, try to develop, and perhaps in the future if I work hard enough in changing my being or my personality or

whatever one in school work could say in their class, then I might know the answer when I study more. When I've worked more.

Q: (Mark) I think I should ask a question I can give a little better answer to you.

Q: I think I should, by your answer... I should leave the flower alone, and let it have its odor or essence or smell and develop in school work further and perhaps the answer will be supplied to me.

H: Good. Satisfactory!

Q: Yes sir. I think maybe I shouldn't have asked the question at all.

H: No, that was all right.

Q: The answer I'll have to find out.

H: Try to think of things about as a sign of life, as which you become aware with certain sense organs, whatever it may be.

Q: Excuse me sir, I'm aware of it.

H: And a flower has its life, and it is necessary for that flower, that particular one, to exist the way it does. It becomes noticed by someone else who has to exist the way they are. It depends on a person living and trying to understand the life of plants. Each person becomes very sensitive to a certain smell of plants as representing that life. It has nothing to do with the essence of the plant. It belongs to the appearance and the creation of an atmosphere in the form of plant ( ), and it uses fragrance. If you want to compare it now to the possibility of man, what does man do in showing his life, that he is really existing and that his life which has to be expressed. He makes an atmosphere which points for higher beings than what we are could become a fragrance. It is not essence, it happens to be a essence, in French, unfortunately ( ), it is only a form of life on the periphery very much like a color or a shape is a form of life the way it is manifested. Man has exactly the same effect and the same



possibility. And if you look at the flower as an example that you would like to emulate, then you have to be alive like the flower to the extent that you also create something which goes out from you towards people else or nature; else maybe will enjoy it, and you do that as a human being in your way and by means of that what is available to you, which is an atmosphere. I call it; it is a form of an expression of one's life in a different kind of density than your physical body; the same way as the fragrance of a flower is different than the body of the flower. Now I am not sure that people in nature also depends on their perception, but it is not necessary to have the perception of a nose or olfactory possibilities of nature, but it may be noticed by someone else as something belonging to me which has greater than me, that that person being sensitive to that kind of density which comes from me and goes out, that he notices the existence of that and concludes that I am alive. That is to some extent a shelter or at least a comfort... But I get stuck on the fact that there is a fragrance which you at the present time happen to like. The principle is life, existing on one level or another.

Q: Mr. Nyland, the fragrance I got mixed up on, because the fragrance is mysterious, this ( )...

N: No it isn't.

Q: It isn't?

N: No. You interpret it.

Q: That's wrong. I shouldn't interpret it.

N: You should simply take whatever the flower gives and whatever your interpretation will be, keep it for you. I've said the flower is a symbol, a symbol of growth and potentiality, waiting up to its fruit. And the question is, what do I when I compare myself with a flower. What do I potentially, and what will be my fruit?

Q: I would like to grow like the flower, and the seed and the fruit, and the heart

of the flower...

H: That is right.

Q: ...and learn from that, learn from that.

H: All it will give you is inspiration that you give in the direction belonging to you.

Q: Excuse me sir, do you mean spiritual inspiration?

H: Inspiration is always spiritual.

Q: Oh. Well, inspiration in the terminology of the word is cheap. I mean in ordinary life the word inspiration, like I was inspired to something, is sort of a slander.

H: You remember that I've used aspiration, inspiration, and silence in connection with each other. They are placed on the scale of the Kundalini body at sol-la-shi. When I talk about inspiration, and I did fairly recently, I compared it to the last note on that particular octave. That kind of inspiration, that ( ) has the value of that name, never is cheap, and is...

Q: I'm sorry, I misinterpreted...I didn't mean...

H: I know. But that's the way, of course, I mean it. Inspiration is a very definite term ( unless )

Q: Yes, yes. That I understand. I'm afraid of words sometimes. Then I make mistakes. I mean...the word is ( ) and I have to keep it in its ordinary life terminology very clear and ( unless, perhaps ), so when I hear it, sometimes hear...I don't quite hear it right. But inspiration is spiritually is of the highest nature...into awareness...is it not?

H: It is higher than aspiration. And aspiration is rather more an "aspire to" something. That what then is needed is an inspiration, that is, an inner knowledge that one can reach it, and that gives us the strength actually to follow it.

Q: Excuse me, sir. First comes aspiration, then comes inspiration. Is that it?



A: Right, this is the end, huh?

Q: Thank you, Dr. Ryland.

A: Good. See you next week. Good night, everybody.

NATIONAL  
COMPASSIBLE  
BOND  
USA  
KCS

100% NON-FIBER CONTENT